

# **EXHIBIT O**

DEFENDANTS' AFFIRMATIVE DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS FOR JOSEPH RANNAZZISI					
DEPO DATE	DESIGNATION TYPE	DEFENDANTS' AFFIRMATIVE DESIGNATIONS			
		Begin Page at	Begin Line at	End Page at	End Line at
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	16	20	17	1
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	16	24	17	1
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	18	18	20	1
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	19	11	19	17
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	19	20	20	1
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	20	10	20	11
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	20	20	21	9
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	21	10	21	13
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	21	15	23	6
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	23	9	23	23
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	23	25	24	7
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	24	10	24	16
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	24	23	25	20
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	26	3	26	5
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	26	8	26	13
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	26	15	26	17
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	26	19	26	23
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	26	25	27	6
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	27	12	27	18
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	27	24	28	6
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	28	13	28	16
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	30	12	31	13
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	31	17	32	5
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	32	9	33	23
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	34	16	34	19
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	35	20	36	19
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	36	25	36	25
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	37	2	37	12
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	37	23	38	10
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	38	12	38	13
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	38	22	38	25
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	39	4	39	4
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	40	12	40	21
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	41	21	41	23
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	42	4	42	6
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	42	8	42	16
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	42	8	42	16
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	42	17	43	14
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	43	21	44	4
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	44	6	44	10
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	45	2	45	6
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	45	10	45	10
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	45	12	46	4
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	46	6	46	7
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	49	24	50	1
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	49	24	50	1
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	51	2	51	8
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	52	10	52	14
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	52	16	52	16
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	52	19	53	11
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	53	16	53	24
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	59	18	59	19
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	59	22	59	22

DEFENDANTS' AFFIRMATIVE DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS FOR JOSEPH RANNAZZISI					
DEPO DATE	DESIGNATION TYPE	DEFENDANTS' AFFIRMATIVE DESIGNATIONS			
		Begin Page at	Begin Line at	End Page at	End Line at
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	59	25	60	1
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	60	3	60	5
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	60	8	60	23
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	61	1	61	1
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	61	7	61	12
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	71	16	71	17
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	71	20	71	23
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	72	8	72	9
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	74	1	74	13
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	74	25	75	11
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	75	17	75	24
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	76	6	76	6
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	76	17	76	18
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	76	22	76	24
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	78	17	78	25
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	79	25	80	2
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	80	4	80	8
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	80	10	80	13
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	80	22	80	25
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	81	2	81	11
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	83	16	84	6
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	84	15	84	20
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	85	3	85	5
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	85	7	85	9
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	86	2	86	3
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	86	8	87	5
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	87	10	87	12
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	87	18	87	21
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	87	25	88	7
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	88	8	88	22
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	88	23	88	25
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	89	15	89	21
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	89	24	90	6
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	92	17	93	18
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	94	3	94	6
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	94	8	94	15
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	95	1	95	22
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	97	25	98	3
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	97	25	98	3
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	98	7	98	9
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	98	7	98	9
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	98	11	98	19
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	100	18	100	19
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	100	24	102	2
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	102	4	102	10
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	102	17	102	21
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	102	23	103	1
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	102	23	103	1
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	103	6	103	10
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	103	6	103	10
4/26/2019	Manu & Dist Affirm	103	23	105	2
4/26/2019	CVS Affirm	103	23	105	2
4/26/2019	CAH Affirm	103	23	105	2

DEFENDANTS' AFFIRMATIVE DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS FOR JOSEPH RANNAZZISI					
DEPO DATE	DESIGNATION TYPE	DEFENDANTS' AFFIRMATIVE DESIGNATIONS			
		Begin Page at	Begin Line at	End Page at	End Line at
4/26/2019	Manu & Dist Affirm	105	21	105	22
4/26/2019	CVS Affirm	105	21	105	22
4/26/2019	CAH Affirm	105	21	105	22
4/26/2019	Manu & Dist Affirm	105	24	106	13
4/26/2019	CVS Affirm	105	24	106	13
4/26/2019	CAH Affirm	105	24	106	13
4/26/2019	Manu & Dist Affirm	106	17	106	24
4/26/2019	CVS Affirm	106	17	106	24
4/26/2019	CAH Affirm	106	17	106	24
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	108	17	108	23
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	108	17	109	9
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	109	6	109	9
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	109	6	109	9
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	109	12	109	16
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	109	12	109	16
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	110	7	110	18
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	111	12	111	13
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	111	18	112	11
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	112	12	112	14
4/26/2019	Allergan Affirm	116	11	116	14
4/26/2019	Endo Affirm	116	11	116	14
4/26/2019	Allergan Affirm	116	16	116	22
4/26/2019	Endo Affirm	116	16	116	22
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	117	19	117	23
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	117	25	118	14
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	118	23	119	9
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	119	12	119	17
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	119	21	120	9
4/26/2019	Allergan Affirm	120	6	120	9
4/26/2019	Allergan Affirm	120	12	120	14
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	120	13	120	14
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	120	18	120	21
4/26/2019	Allergan Affirm	120	18	120	21
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	120	23	121	10
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	121	13	121	15
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	126	5	126	23
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	128	25	129	3
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	129	5	129	22
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	131	21	132	3
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	132	12	132	22
4/26/2019	Manu & Dist Affirm	140	14	140	19
4/26/2019	Manu & Dist Affirm	140	23	141	4
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	171	9	171	12
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	171	15	171	15
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	180	1	180	5
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	180	21	180	25
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	181	4	181	6
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	182	6	182	13
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	182	19	182	22
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	183	16	184	19
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	184	22	185	2
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	185	11	185	23
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	186	3	186	4

DEFENDANTS' AFFIRMATIVE DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS FOR JOSEPH RANNAZZISI					
DEPO DATE	DESIGNATION TYPE	DEFENDANTS' AFFIRMATIVE DESIGNATIONS			
		Begin Page at	Begin Line at	End Page at	End Line at
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	186	7	186	25
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	187	5	187	13
4/26/2019	Pharm Affirm	188	14	188	17
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	188	14	188	17
4/26/2019	Pharm Affirm	188	19	188	21
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	188	19	188	21
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	188	22	189	3
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	189	6	189	19
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	189	24	190	8
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	190	12	190	16
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	190	19	191	5
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	191	6	191	10
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	191	18	192	17
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	192	19	193	6
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	193	8	193	9
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	193	19	193	21
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	193	23	194	2
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	195	9	195	13
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	195	17	196	3
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	196	6	196	21
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	197	4	197	6
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	197	9	197	16
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	199	15	199	17
4/26/2019	Pharm Affirm	199	15	199	17
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	199	23	200	4
4/26/2019	Pharm Affirm	199	23	200	4
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	200	6	200	11
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	200	16	200	23
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	200	25	201	3
4/26/2019	Pharm Affirm	200	25	201	3
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	201	10	201	19
4/26/2019	Pharm Affirm	201	10	201	24
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	201	21	201	24
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	202	4	202	8
4/26/2019	Pharm Affirm	202	4	202	8
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	204	6	204	12
4/26/2019	Pharm Affirm	204	6	204	12
4/26/2019	CAH Affirm	204	6	204	12
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	204	15	204	18
4/26/2019	Pharm Affirm	204	15	204	18
4/26/2019	CAH Affirm	204	15	204	18
4/26/2019	Pharm Affirm	213	6	213	9
4/26/2019	Pharm Affirm	213	11	213	25
4/26/2019	Pharm Affirm	214	1	214	8
4/26/2019	Pharm Affirm	214	10	214	17
4/26/2019	Pharm Affirm	214	22	215	7
4/26/2019	Pharm Affirm	215	15	215	22
4/26/2019	Pharm Affirm	216	2	216	6
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	217	11	217	15
4/26/2019	Giant Eagle Affirm	217	11	217	15
4/26/2019	CAH Affirm	217	11	217	15
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	217	20	217	24
4/26/2019	CAH Affirm	217	20	217	24

DEFENDANTS' AFFIRMATIVE DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS FOR JOSEPH RANNAZZISI					
DEPO DATE	DESIGNATION TYPE	DEFENDANTS' AFFIRMATIVE DESIGNATIONS			
		Begin Page at	Begin Line at	End Page at	End Line at
4/26/2019	Giant Eagle Affirm	217	20	218	4
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	218	1	218	4
4/26/2019	CAH Affirm	218	1	218	4
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	218	9	218	13
4/26/2019	Giant Eagle Affirm	218	9	218	13
4/26/2019	CAH Affirm	218	9	218	13
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	218	14	220	10
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	220	12	221	3
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	221	9	221	13
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	221	15	221	16
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	221	18	222	7
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	222	9	222	14
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	222	17	222	18
4/26/2019	Manu & Dist Affirm	222	20	222	23
4/26/2019	Manu & Dist Affirm	223	5	223	9
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	226	16	228	10
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	228	23	229	13
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	229	15	229	19
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	229	21	230	5
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	230	7	230	15
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	230	16	231	10
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	231	13	232	13
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	232	15	233	12
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	233	23	234	7
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	234	12	234	24
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	235	2	235	8
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	235	24	236	3
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	236	7	236	14
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	238	7	238	10
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	238	14	239	7
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	239	9	239	12
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	239	14	239	20
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	239	24	240	14
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	240	17	240	20
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	240	22	241	1
4/26/2019	Pharm Affirm	240	22	241	1
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	241	4	241	9
4/26/2019	Pharm Affirm	241	4	241	15
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	241	11	241	15
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	241	18	241	19
4/26/2019	Pharm Affirm	241	18	241	25
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	241	21	241	25
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	242	3	242	4
4/26/2019	Pharm Affirm	242	3	242	4
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	242	6	243	25
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	247	15	247	23
4/26/2019	Pharm Affirm	247	15	247	23
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	248	3	248	6
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	248	12	248	21
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	249	3	249	10
4/26/2019	Pharm Affirm	251	10	251	14
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	251	10	251	14
4/26/2019	CAH Affirm	251	10	251	24

DEFENDANTS' AFFIRMATIVE DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS FOR JOSEPH RANNAZZISI					
DEPO DATE	DESIGNATION TYPE	DEFENDANTS' AFFIRMATIVE DESIGNATIONS			
		Begin Page at	Begin Line at	End Page at	End Line at
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	251	21	251	24
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	252	2	252	11
4/26/2019	CAH Affirm	252	2	252	11
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	252	16	252	24
4/26/2019	CAH Affirm	252	16	252	24
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	258	4	258	8
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	259	3	260	9
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	260	14	261	12
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	261	14	262	2
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	262	5	262	8
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	262	17	262	19
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	262	22	263	10
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	263	13	264	7
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	264	10	264	17
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	264	19	265	4
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	267	8	267	14
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	267	20	268	20
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	268	23	269	5
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	269	7	269	17
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	269	19	270	3
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	270	8	270	16
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	270	21	271	8
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	271	12	272	4
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	272	7	273	13
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	273	20	274	13
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	274	18	275	15
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	275	19	276	2
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	277	8	277	15
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	277	21	278	17
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	278	23	279	11
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	279	17	279	20
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	279	22	280	16
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	280	17	280	19
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	281	1	281	4
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	282	4	282	17
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	286	13	286	15
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	286	22	287	1
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	287	14	288	9
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	288	13	288	24
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	289	22	290	9
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	290	14	291	15
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	291	19	291	23
4/26/2019	Pharm Affirm	291	19	291	23
4/26/2019	CAH Affirm	291	19	291	23
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	292	1	292	1
4/26/2019	Pharm Affirm	292	1	292	1
4/26/2019	CAH Affirm	292	1	292	1
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	292	4	292	12
4/26/2019	CAH Affirm	292	4	292	12
4/26/2019	Pharm Affirm	292	4	292	17
4/26/2019	CAH Affirm	292	4	292	17
4/26/2019	Pharm Affirm	293	4	293	6
4/26/2019	CAH Affirm	293	4	293	6

DEFENDANTS' AFFIRMATIVE DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS FOR JOSEPH RANNAZZISI					
DEPO DATE	DESIGNATION TYPE	DEFENDANTS' AFFIRMATIVE DESIGNATIONS			
		Begin Page at	Begin Line at	End Page at	End Line at
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	297	9	297	20
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	297	22	297	22
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	297	25	298	1
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	298	3	298	5
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	299	2	299	4
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	299	7	299	11
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	303	5	303	8
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	303	11	305	5
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	309	3	309	9
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	310	14	310	19
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	310	24	311	1
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	313	4	313	9
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	313	15	313	21
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	313	23	313	23
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	314	21	314	24
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	315	6	316	2
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	316	4	316	12
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	317	3	317	4
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	317	5	317	6
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	317	10	317	10
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	317	14	317	18
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	317	22	318	2
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	318	6	318	7
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	320	1	320	3
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	320	6	320	10
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	320	12	320	19
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	320	25	321	10
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	321	14	321	25
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	322	5	322	18
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	322	22	323	15
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	324	3	324	7
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	324	9	324	13
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	324	19	324	24
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	327	6	327	9
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	327	17	327	24
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	328	1	328	3
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	328	8	328	9
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	328	11	328	11
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	328	14	329	3
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	328	17	328	21
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	328	24	329	3
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	329	5	329	7
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	331	2	331	5
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	331	12	331	16
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	332	25	333	3
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	333	6	333	8
4/26/2019	Dist Affirm	340	8	340	13
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	340	14	340	18
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	340	22	340	23
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	344	11	344	15
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	344	19	344	25
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	346	2	346	4
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	346	9	346	20

DEFENDANTS' AFFIRMATIVE DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS FOR JOSEPH RANNAZZISI					
DEPO DATE	DESIGNATION TYPE	DEFENDANTS' AFFIRMATIVE DESIGNATIONS			
		Begin Page at	Begin Line at	End Page at	End Line at
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	346	22	346	22
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	347	3	347	3
4/26/2019	All Def Affirm	356	15	357	18
5/15/2019	Giant Eagle Affirm	453	13	454	8
5/15/2019	Walmart Affirm	453	16	453	25
5/15/2019	Walmart Affirm	454	1	454	5
5/15/2019	Dist Affirm	515	2	516	4
5/15/2019	Dist Affirm	517	14	518	9
5/15/2019	Manu Affirm	518	10	518	18
5/15/2019	CAH Affirm	518	10	519	6
5/15/2019	Dist Affirm	518	19	519	15
5/15/2019	Pharm Affirm	518	19	519	15
5/15/2019	Dist Affirm	520	1	520	2
5/15/2019	Pharm Affirm	520	1	520	7
5/15/2019	Dist Affirm	520	4	520	7
5/15/2019	Dist Affirm	520	10	520	10
5/15/2019	Pharm Affirm	520	10	520	15
5/15/2019	Dist Affirm	520	12	520	15
5/15/2019	Dist Affirm	521	11	521	14
5/15/2019	Pharm Affirm	521	11	521	14
5/15/2019	CAH Affirm	521	11	521	14
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	523	7	523	15
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	523	16	524	9
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	524	10	524	17
5/15/2019	Manu & Dist Affirm	525	3	528	14
5/15/2019	Dist Affirm	528	15	528	19
5/15/2019	Manu & Dist Affirm	528	20	530	16
5/15/2019	Pharm Affirm	530	7	530	16
5/15/2019	CAH Affirm	530	7	530	21
5/15/2019	Dist Affirm	530	17	530	21
5/15/2019	Pharm Affirm	530	17	530	21
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	531	20	534	20
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	535	6	535	15
5/15/2019	Dist Affirm	537	6	538	1
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	538	2	538	7
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	538	13	540	17
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	540	20	541	15
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	541	17	542	21
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	543	6	543	16
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	544	7	544	8
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	544	12	544	19
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	544	21	545	15
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	545	17	545	18
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	546	6	546	16
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	547	12	548	15
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	548	18	548	25
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	549	4	549	12
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	549	16	549	20
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	550	25	551	21
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	551	24	552	15
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	552	19	553	9
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	553	12	554	6
5/15/2019	Dist Affirm	555	7	555	25

DEFENDANTS' AFFIRMATIVE DEPOSITION DESIGNATIONS FOR JOSEPH RANNAZZISI					
DEPO DATE	DESIGNATION TYPE	DEFENDANTS' AFFIRMATIVE DESIGNATIONS			
		Begin Page at	Begin Line at	End Page at	End Line at
5/15/2019	Dist Affirm	556	14	558	1
5/15/2019	Dist Affirm	558	13	558	17
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	562	8	564	17
5/15/2019	Manu & Dist Affirm	565	9	567	6
5/15/2019	Manu & Dist Affirm	567	9	567	25
5/15/2019	Manu & Dist Affirm	571	4	571	24
5/15/2019	Manu & Dist Affirm	571	25	573	17
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	574	15	575	15
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	576	3	576	16
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	576	18	576	19
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	576	21	577	2
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	579	9	582	8
5/15/2019	Dist Affirm	584	2	585	25
5/15/2019	Pharm Affirm	584	13	586	24
5/15/2019	Dist Affirm	586	1	586	24
5/15/2019	Dist Affirm	589	20	590	4
5/15/2019	Pharm Affirm	589	20	590	4
5/15/2019	Dist Affirm	590	22	590	25
5/15/2019	Pharm Affirm	590	22	591	1
5/15/2019	Dist Affirm	591	1	592	12
5/15/2019	Dist Affirm	592	16	593	2
5/15/2019	Dist Affirm	593	7	593	17
5/15/2019	Dist Affirm	593	19	594	21
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	594	22	595	15
5/15/2019	Dist Affirm	595	16	595	25
5/15/2019	Dist Affirm	596	2	596	2
5/15/2019	Dist Affirm	596	4	596	4
5/15/2019	Dist Affirm	596	6	597	9
5/15/2019	Dist Affirm	599	6	599	25
5/15/2019	Dist Affirm	600	4	601	20
5/15/2019	Dist Affirm	601	22	602	9
5/15/2019	Dist Affirm	602	12	602	21
5/15/2019	Dist Affirm	602	25	603	10
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	611	6	611	17
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	611	19	612	2
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	615	4	615	22
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	616	13	616	18
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	616	13	617	1
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	616	22	617	1
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	624	12	626	7
5/15/2019	All Def Affirm	628	13	630	2

DEFENDANTS' RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS' OBJECTIONS TO AFFIRMATIVE DESIGNATIONS OF JOSEPH RANNAZZISI					
DEPO DATE	NOTES				NOTES
	Begin Page at	Begin Line at	End Page at	End Line at	
4/26/2019	1	7	1	7	
4/26/2019	19	18	19	19	RESPONSE: Testimony not designated.
4/26/2019	19	24	20	11	RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control. Not Argumentative.
4/26/2019	20	7	200	9	RESPONSE: Plaintiffs' objection is overbroad and impossible to provide a response to without Plaintiffs actually providing information as to what testimony they are objecting to.
4/26/2019	22	11	23	13	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to Suspicious Order Monitoring: Testimony is relevant to DEA's policy on suspicious order monitoring and reporting, which are central issues in this case. The Court expressly held that DEA's interpretation and enforcement of the suspicious order monitoring regulation—including "whether DEA investigators view [monthly ILRs and Excessive Order Reports] as compliant with the CSA," whether DEA accepted certain defendants' reporting as compliant, whether "DEA imposed a no-ship requirement," and whether DEA changed its interpretation of the law are "material facts in dispute that must be resolved by a jury. See Order and Opinion Regarding Plaintiffs' Summary Judgment Motions Addressing the Controlled Substances Act [Dkt. # 2483], at 28–29</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Outside Scope – Covered by DOJ Authorization: Testimony is covered by the December 10, 2018 letter from Ava Rostell Dustin authorizing witness to testify regarding his personal recollection on 10 topics, including his employment history and general duties in various positions held at DEA; communications with registrants about what makes an order "suspicious"; advice he provided third-parties regarding registrants' obligation to monitor orders place with third-party registrants; interactions with manufacturers and distributors while at DEA; DEA's practices and procedures relating to ARCOS data and suspicious order reports; requests received by DEA for de-identified ARCOS data; his role in establishing procurement and manufacturing quotas for opioid medications; information regarding the non-privileged documents he obtained while at DEA and retained at the time of his departure; and DEA's interpretation and enforcement of, and practices related to 21 U.S.C. § 823 and 21 C.F.R. § 1301.74 and DEA's interpretation, enforcement, and practices regarding the obligation to monitor orders. See Dkt. # 1176.3., Not Overbroad, Vague, or Speculative: Foundational question to establish basis for further testimony.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does Not Seek Testimony About the Mindset of DEA: Asks for witness's personal recollection of DEA's interpretation, policies, and procedures, based on his experience during his career at DEA</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Argumentative.</p>
4/26/2019	23	22	24	1	<p>RESPONSE: Does Not Lack Foundation or Call for Speculation: Question asks for witness's personal understanding of DEA's suspicious order reporting policy and guidance, which he developed during his tenure as head of DEA's Office of Diversion Control. Witness testified extensively about his personal experience regarding how the Office of Diversion Control, under his leadership, interpreted and enforced the CSA and 21 C.F.R. 1301.74(b),</p> <p>RESPONSE: Within scope – Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.,</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Overbroad, Vague, or Speculative: Foundational question to establish basis for further testimony.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Testimony Re: Use of ARCOS/Suspicious Order Reports Is Relevant to causation.,</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Argumentative.</p>
4/26/2019	24	3	24	16	<p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Within scope – Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.,</p> <p>RESPONSE: Testimony Re: Use of ARCOS/Suspicious Order Reports Is Relevant to causation.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Argumentative.</p>
4/26/2019	24	23	26	20	<p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Within scope – Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Testimony Re: Use of ARCOS/Suspicious Order Reports Is Relevant to causation., Not Argumentative.</p>
4/26/2019	26	3	28	16	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to SOM: Relates to DEA's policy on suspicious order monitoring and reporting, including whether DEA's policy and interpretation changed, which are fact issues. See Dkt. # 2483 at 28-29.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Scope N/A: Touhy authorization not required for information learned outside witness's employment at DEA.,</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Overbroad, Vague, or Speculative: Foundational question to establish basis for further testimony .</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p>
4/26/2019	30	16	30	19	<p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Testimony Relating to Quotas Is Relevant to causation and defendants' scienter.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p>

DEFENDANTS' RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS' OBJECTIONS TO AFFIRMATIVE DESIGNATIONS OF JOSEPH RANNAZZISI					
DEPO DATE	NOTES				NOTES
	Begin Page at	Begin Line at	End Page at	End Line at	
4/26/2019	31	5	31	19	<p>RESPONSE: Within scope – Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Overbroad, Vague, or Speculative: Foundational question to establish basis for further testimony.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does Not Seek Testimony About the Mindset of DEA: Asks for witness's personal recollection of DEA's interpretation, policies, and procedures, based on his experience during his career at DEA.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Testimony Relating to Quotas Does Not Lack Foundation and Is Not Speculative: Question asks for witness's personal knowledge about the process for setting quotas, a topic specifically authorized by DOJ. The Group responsible for establishing quotas reported to witness from 2006–2015, and witness was responsible for approving annual quotas for opioids.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague. RESPONSE: Not Argumentative.</p>
4/26/2019	32	9	33	23	<p>RESPONSE: Testimony Re: Use of ARCOS/Suspicious Order Reports Is Relevant to causation.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Argumentative.</p>
4/26/2019	34	16	39	4	RESPONSE: Will withdraw on the basis of lack of personal knowledge of document, provided that plaintiffs do the same with respect to their designations of testimony from other fact witnesses.
4/26/2019	44	1	46	7	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to SOM: Relates to DEA's policy on suspicious order monitoring and reporting, including whether DEA's policy and interpretation changed, which are fact issues. See Dkt. # 2483 at 28-29.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control. RESPONSE: Within scope – Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does Not Seek Testimony About the Mindset of DEA: Asks for witness's personal recollection of DEA's interpretation, policies, and procedures, based on his experience during his career at DEA.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Argumentative.</p>
4/26/2019	49	24	50	1	<p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control. RESPONSE: Within scope – Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Overbroad, Vague, or Speculative: Foundational question to establish basis for further testimony.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Argumentative. Question does not refer to or mischaracterize prior testimony, as evidenced by the witness's agreement.</p>
4/26/2019	52	10	53	2	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to causation.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Within scope – Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p> <p>Added responsive designation to include witness's complete response.</p>
4/26/2019	53	3	53	24	<p>RESPONSE: Objection includes many lines that were not designated. Relevant to causation. Not speculative -- many of witness's personal documents and PowerPoint presentations refer to these types of diversion.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Within scope – Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p>
4/26/2019	59	18	61	12	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to causation. Not speculative, vague, or lacking foundation -- asks whether witness was aware of certain criticism being made.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Argumentative.</p>
4/26/2019	71	16	72	9	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to bias. Existence of agreement with plaintiffs is not privileged. Not speculative or lacking foundation -- question asked witness whether he personally had a consulting agreement, which is a fact within the scope of his personal knowledge. Touhy does not apply to question about post-DEA employment.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Argumentative.</p>

DEFENDANTS' RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS' OBJECTIONS TO AFFIRMATIVE DESIGNATIONS OF JOSEPH RANNAZZISI					
DEPO DATE	NOTES				NOTES
	Begin Page at	Begin Line at	End Page at	End Line at	
4/26/2019	74	25	78	25	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to bias. Privilege objections to designated questions were overruled during the deposition. Designated testimony involves questions about witness's employment as a consultant, which are purely factual questions -- not speculative, vague, or lacking foundation.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Scope N/A: Touhy authorization not required for information learned outside witness's employment at DEA.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Argumentative.</p>
4/26/2019	79	25	84	20	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to bias. Privilege objections to designated questions were overruled during the deposition. Designated testimony involves questions about witness's employment as a consultant, which are purely factual questions -- not speculative, vague, or lacking foundation.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Scope N/A: Touhy authorization not required for information learned outside witness's employment at DEA.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Argumentative.</p>
4/26/2019	85	3	88	2	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to bias. Privilege objections to designated questions were overruled during the deposition. Designated testimony involves questions about witness's employment as a consultant, which are purely factual questions -- not speculative, vague, or lacking foundation.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Scope N/A: Touhy authorization not required for information learned outside witness's employment at DEA.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Argumentative.</p>
4/26/2019	88	3	88	25	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to bias. Designated testimony involves questions about witness's employment as a consultant, which are purely factual questions -- not lacking foundation.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p>
4/26/2019	89	15	90	6	<p>RESPONSE: Within the scope of topic #9 of Touhy authorization letter. Not lacking foundation or speculative -- questions relate to facts within the witness's personal knowledge.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Argumentative.</p>
4/26/2019	92	24	93	18	<p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Within scope -- Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Testimony Relating to Quotas Is Relevant to causation and defendants' scienter.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Overbroad, Vague, or Speculative: Foundational question to establish basis for further testimony.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Questions track language of DEA regulations for establishing quotas -- not speculative, vague, or lacking foundation.</p>
4/26/2019	9	3	94	6	RESPONSE: Plaintiffs' objection is overbroad and impossible to provide a response to without Plaintiffs actually providing information as to what testimony they are objecting to.
4/26/2019	94	8	94	15	<p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Testimony Relating to Quotas Is Relevant to causation and defendants' scienter.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p>
4/26/2019	95	1	95	22	<p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Within scope -- Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not duplicative/cumulative of other designations from witness's testimony or any other DEA witness. To the extent multiple DEA witnesses testified on similar subjects, relevant to show common understanding among DEA officials.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Testimony Relating to Quotas Is Relevant to causation and defendants' scienter.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p>

DEFENDANTS' RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS' OBJECTIONS TO AFFIRMATIVE DESIGNATIONS OF JOSEPH RANNAZZISI					
DEPO DATE	NOTES				NOTES
	Begin Page at	Begin Line at	End Page at	End Line at	
4/26/2019	97	25	98	19	<p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Within scope – Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Testimony Relating to Quotas Is Relevant to causation and defendants' scienter.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p>
4/26/2019	100	18	103	10	<p>RESPONSE: Within scope – Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Testimony Relating to Quotas Is Relevant to causation and defendants' scienter.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does Not Seek Testimony About the Mindset of DEA: Asks for witness's personal recollection of DEA's interpretation, policies, and procedures, based on his experience during his career at DEA.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Improper objection covering multiple questions. Defendants cannot respond unless plaintiffs identify which form objection(s) apply to which question(s).</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Argumentative.</p>
4/26/2019	103	23	106	24	<p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Within scope – Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Testimony Relating to Quotas Is Relevant to causation and defendants' scienter.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Questions relate to statements made by witness on a podcast and lay the necessary foundation for testimony about the transcript.</p>
4/26/2019	108	17	109	16	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to SOM: Relates to DEA's policy on suspicious order monitoring and reporting, including whether DEA's policy and interpretation changed, which are fact issues. See Dkt. # 2483 at 28-29.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Within scope – Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p>
4/26/2019	110	7	110	18	RESPONSE: Relevant to SOM: Relates to DEA's policy on suspicious order monitoring and reporting, including whether DEA's policy and interpretation changed, which are fact issues. See Dkt. # 2483 at 28-29.
4/26/2019	111	11	111	20	<p>RESPONSE: Within scope – Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not asked and answered -- previous answer was not responsive to question. Question does not pose a hypothetical -- asks for witness's understanding of manufacturers' responsibilities to regulate supply chain.</p>
4/26/2019	111	22	112	14	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to SOM: Relates to DEA's policy on suspicious order monitoring and reporting, including whether DEA's policy and interpretation changed, which are fact issues. See Dkt. # 2483 at 28-29.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Within scope – Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not asked and answered -- prior answers are not responsive to the question.</p>
4/26/2019	116	11	116	22	RESPONSE: Testimony was not designated by defendants.

DEFENDANTS' RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS' OBJECTIONS TO AFFIRMATIVE DESIGNATIONS OF JOSEPH RANNAZZISI					
DEPO DATE	NOTES				NOTES
	Begin Page at	Begin Line at	End Page at	End Line at	
4/26/2019	120	6	120	21	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to SOM: Relates to DEA's policy on suspicious order monitoring and reporting, including whether DEA's policy and interpretation.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Within scope – Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not duplicative/cumulative of other designations from witness's testimony or any other DEA witness. To the extent multiple DEA witnesses testified on similar subjects, relevant to show common understanding among DEA officials.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Testimony Relating to Quotas Is Relevant to causation and defendants' scienter.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Argumentative</p>
4/26/2019	120	23	121	15	<p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Within scope – Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Testimony Re: Use of ARCOS/Suspicious Order Reports Is Relevant to causation.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p>
4/26/2019	126	5	126	23	RESPONSE: Relevant to credibility/bias.
4/26/2019	128	25	129	22	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to credibility and bias.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Scope N/A: Touhy authorization not required for information learned outside witness's employment at DEA.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p>
4/26/2019	131	21	132	3	<p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Within scope – Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Overbroad, Vague, or Speculative: Foundational question to establish basis for further testimony.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p>
4/26/2019	132	12	132	22	<p>RESPONSE: Not duplicative/cumulative of other designations from witness's testimony or any other DEA witness. To the extent multiple DEA witnesses testified on similar subjects, relevant to show common understanding among DEA officials.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Overbroad, Vague, or Speculative: Foundational question to establish basis for further testimony.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Argumentative.</p>
4/26/2019	140	14	141	4	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to SOM: Relates to DEA's policy on suspicious order monitoring and reporting, including whether DEA's policy and interpretation changed, which are fact issues. See Dkt. # 2483 at 28-29.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not duplicative/cumulative of other designations from witness's testimony or any other DEA witness. To the extent multiple DEA witnesses testified on similar subjects, relevant to show common understanding among DEA officials.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Argumentative.</p>
4/26/2019	171	9	171	15	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to SOM: Relates to DEA's policy on suspicious order monitoring and reporting, including whether DEA's policy and interpretation changed, which are fact issues. See Dkt. # 2483 at 28-29.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Argumentative.</p>

DEFENDANTS' RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS' OBJECTIONS TO AFFIRMATIVE DESIGNATIONS OF JOSEPH RANNAZZISI					
DEPO DATE	NOTES				NOTES
	Begin Page at	Begin Line at	End Page at	End Line at	
4/26/2019	180	1	180	5	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to SOM: Relates to DEA's policy on suspicious order monitoring and reporting, including whether DEA's policy and interpretation changed, which are fact issues. See Dkt. # 2483 at 28-29.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Argumentative.</p>
4/26/2019	180	21	181	6	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to SOM: Relates to DEA's policy on suspicious order monitoring and reporting, including whether DEA's policy and interpretation changed, which are fact issues. See Dkt. # 2483 at 28-29.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Argumentative.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not a proper 602 objection -- witness was asked IF He had no personal knowledge about an event to establish foundation for further examination. He was not, for example, being asked questions about events he did not attend.</p>
4/26/2019	182	6	182	22	<p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Within scope -- Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not speculative or overbroad -- question asks witness to confirm a statement he made in testimony to Congress. Relevant to causation.</p>
4/26/2019	184	13	184	19	<p>RESPONSE: Question asks about witness's own general practice for responding to questions from Congress. Not vague, speculative, or lacking foundation. Foundation laid for Congressional testimony being one of his "general job duties" at DEA.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p>
4/26/2019	185	11	186	13	<p>RESPONSE: Not compound -- question was "Did I read that question accurately?" Plaintiffs' counsel objected before defense counsel was able to finish reading the relevant passage and asking the question. Relevant to causation. Witness has personal knowledge based on his experience at DEA; he had previously testified before Congress on the subject. Relevant to causation.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p>
4/26/2019	188	23	190	8	RESPONSE: Relevant to causation.
4/26/2019	190	19	194	2	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to causation. Foundation: Questions relate to prior Congressional testimony by witness. Hearsay: Not hearsay because questions relate to witness's own prior testimony before Congress. No misstatement of the record: Counsel read exhibit to witness and asked questions about the direct quotes. No completeness problem: witness referenced additional testimony after speaking objection from plaintiffs' counsel.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p>
4/26/2019	195	9	196	21	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to causation. Not compound --operative question is "would that be diversion?" . Not an incomplete hypothetical -- no additional information needed for witness to answer question.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Within scope -- Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p>
4/26/2019	196	18	197	16	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to SOM: Relates to DEA's policy on suspicious order monitoring and reporting, including whether DEA's policy and interpretation changed, which are fact issues. See Dkt. # 2483 at 28-29.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Within scope -- Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p>

DEFENDANTS' RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS' OBJECTIONS TO AFFIRMATIVE DESIGNATIONS OF JOSEPH RANNAZZISI					
DEPO DATE	NOTES				NOTES
	Begin Page at	Begin Line at	End Page at	End Line at	
4/26/2019	199	15	202	8	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to SOM: Relates to DEA's policy on suspicious order monitoring and reporting, including whether DEA's policy and interpretation changed, which are fact issues. See Dkt. # 2483 at 28-29.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Within scope – Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not duplicative/cumulative of other designations from witness's testimony or any other DEA witness. To the extent multiple DEA witnesses testified on similar subjects, relevant to show common understanding among DEA officials.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Improper objection covering multiple questions. Defendants cannot respond unless plaintiffs identify which form objection(s) apply to which question(s).</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p>
4/26/2019	204	5	204	18	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to SOM: Relates to DEA's policy on suspicious order monitoring and reporting, including whether DEA's policy and interpretation changed, which are fact issues. See Dkt. # 2483 at 28-29.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Within scope – Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Question is not a hypothetical, let alone an incomplete hypothetical.</p>
4/26/2019	213	6	216	6	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to SOM: Relates to DEA's policy on suspicious order monitoring and reporting, including whether DEA's policy and interpretation changed, which are fact issues. See Dkt. # 2483 at 28-29.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not duplicative/cumulative of other designations from witness's testimony or any other DEA witness. To the extent multiple DEA witnesses testified on similar subjects, relevant to show common understanding among DEA officials.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Improper objection covering multiple questions. Defendants cannot respond unless plaintiffs identify which form objection(s) apply to which question(s).</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p>
4/26/2019	217	11	223	9	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to SOM: Relates to DEA's policy on suspicious order monitoring and reporting, including whether DEA's policy and interpretation changed, which are fact issues. See Dkt. # 2483 at 28-29.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Within scope – Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not "Asked and Answered": Question was not previously asked by defense counsel.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p>
4/26/2019	227	24	228	6	<p>RESPONSE: Not duplicative/cumulative of other designations from witness's testimony or any other DEA witness. To the extent multiple DEA witnesses testified on similar subjects, relevant to show common understanding among DEA officials.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Overbroad, Vague, or Speculative: Foundational question to establish basis for further testimony.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p>
4/26/2019	229	10	229	22	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to SOM: Relates to DEA's policy on suspicious order monitoring and reporting, including whether DEA's policy and interpretation changed, which are fact issues. See Dkt. # 2483 at 28-29.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Within scope – Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not duplicative/cumulative of other designations from witness's testimony or any other DEA witness. To the extent multiple DEA witnesses testified on similar subjects, relevant to show common understanding among DEA officials.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not "Asked and Answered": Question was not previously asked by defense counsel.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p>

DEFENDANTS' RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS' OBJECTIONS TO AFFIRMATIVE DESIGNATIONS OF JOSEPH RANNAZZISI					
DEPO DATE	NOTES				NOTES
	Begin Page at	Begin Line at	End Page at	End Line at	
4/26/2019	229	24	230	2	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to SOM: Relates to DEA's policy on suspicious order monitoring and reporting, including whether DEA's policy and interpretation changed, which are fact issues. See Dkt. # 2483 at 28-29.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Within scope – Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not duplicative/cumulative of other designations from witness's testimony or any other DEA witness. To the extent multiple DEA witnesses testified on similar subjects, relevant to show common understanding among DEA officials.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not "Asked and Answered": Question was not previously asked by defense counsel.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p>
4/26/2019	230	3	230	15	<p>RESPONSE: Question was clarified before the witness answered.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Relevant to SOM: Relates to DEA's policy on suspicious order monitoring and reporting, including whether DEA's policy and interpretation changed, which are fact issues. See Dkt. # 2483 at 28-29.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Within scope – Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not duplicative/cumulative of other designations from witness's testimony or any other DEA witness. To the extent multiple DEA witnesses testified on similar subjects, relevant to show common understanding among DEA officials.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p>
4/26/2019	233	23	236	14	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to SOM: Relates to DEA's policy on suspicious order monitoring and reporting, including whether DEA's policy and interpretation changed, which are fact issues. See Dkt. # 2483 at 28-29.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Within scope – Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not duplicative/cumulative of other designations from witness's testimony or any other DEA witness. To the extent multiple DEA witnesses testified on similar subjects, relevant to show common understanding among DEA officials.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Improper objection covering multiple questions. Defendants cannot respond unless plaintiffs identify which form objection(s) apply to which question(s).</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p>
4/26/2019	238	7	238	20	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to SOM: Relates to DEA's policy on suspicious order monitoring and reporting, including whether DEA's policy and interpretation changed, which are fact issues. See Dkt. # 2483 at 28-29.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Within scope – Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p>
4/26/2019	240	2	240	20	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to SOM: Relates to DEA's policy on suspicious order monitoring and reporting, including whether DEA's policy and interpretation changed, which are fact issues. See Dkt. # 2483 at 28-29.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Within scope – Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not duplicative/cumulative of other designations from witness's testimony or any other DEA witness. To the extent multiple DEA witnesses testified on similar subjects, relevant to show common understanding among DEA officials.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p>
4/26/2019	240	12	240	20	<p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not duplicative/cumulative of other designations from witness's testimony or any other DEA witness. To the extent multiple DEA witnesses testified on similar subjects, relevant to show common understanding among DEA officials.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p>

DEFENDANTS' RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS' OBJECTIONS TO AFFIRMATIVE DESIGNATIONS OF JOSEPH RANNAZZISI					
DEPO DATE	NOTES				NOTES
	Begin Page at	Begin Line at	End Page at	End Line at	
4/26/2019	240	22	241	9	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to SOM: Relates to DEA's policy on suspicious order monitoring and reporting, including whether DEA's policy and interpretation changed, which are fact issues. See Dkt. # 2483 at 28-29.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p>
4/26/2019	241	11	242	4	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to SOM: Relates to DEA's policy on suspicious order monitoring and reporting, including whether DEA's policy and interpretation changed, which are fact issues. See Dkt. # 2483 at 28-29.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not duplicative/cumulative of other designations from witness's testimony or any other DEA witness. To the extent multiple DEA witnesses testified on similar subjects, relevant to show common understanding among DEA officials.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p>
4/26/2019	242	6	243	25	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to SOM: Relates to DEA's policy on suspicious order monitoring and reporting, including whether DEA's policy and interpretation changed, which are fact issues. See Dkt. # 2483 at 28-29.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Improper objection covering multiple questions. Defendants cannot respond unless plaintiffs identify which form objection(s) apply to which question(s).</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Objection spans multiple topics, including letters sent to registrants under the witness's signature. Witness clearly has personal knowledge of those letters. Questions about distributor initiative establish his lack of personal knowledge of those meetings.</p>
4/26/2019	248	3	248	17	<p>RESPONSE: Does not misstate testimony -- Mr. Prevotnik testified that DEA stopped briefings because of litigation. Not proper 602 objection -- merely establishes the witness's lack of personal knowledge.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Relevant to SOM: Relates to DEA's policy on suspicious order monitoring and reporting, including whether DEA's policy and interpretation changed, which are fact issues. See Dkt. # 2483 at 28-29.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p>
4/26/2019	248	19	249	10	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to SOM: Relates to DEA's policy on suspicious order monitoring and reporting, including whether DEA's policy and interpretation changed, which are fact issues. See Dkt. # 2483 at 28-29.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Within scope -- Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does not mischaracterize testimony -- witness agreed with premise of the question.</p>
4/26/2019	251	21	252	5	<p>RESPONSE: Not vague in light of prior questions, which establish context and foundation. Foundation: witness testified that he reviewed the memos.</p>
4/26/2019	252	7	252	24	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to SOM: Relates to DEA's policy on suspicious order monitoring and reporting, including whether DEA's policy and interpretation changed, which are fact issues. See Dkt. # 2483 at 28-29.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not duplicative/cumulative of other designations from witness's testimony or any other DEA witness. To the extent multiple DEA witnesses testified on similar subjects, relevant to show common understanding among DEA officials.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not improper hypothetical -- question asks about witness's typical practice while working at the Office of Diversion Control.</p>

DEFENDANTS' RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS' OBJECTIONS TO AFFIRMATIVE DESIGNATIONS OF JOSEPH RANNAZZISI					
DEPO DATE	NOTES				NOTES
	Begin Page at	Begin Line at	End Page at	End Line at	
4/26/2019	261	1	265	4	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to SOM: Relates to DEA's policy on suspicious order monitoring and reporting, including whether DEA's policy and interpretation changed, which are fact issues. See Dkt. # 2483 at 28-29.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Within scope – Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Improper objection covering multiple questions. Defendants cannot respond unless plaintiffs identify which form objection(s) apply to which question(s).</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague</p> <p>RESPONSE: DOJ specifically authorized testimony on the witness's personal recollection regarding DEA's interpretation and enforcement of 21 C.F.R. 1374(b). Plaintiffs must identify which question (out of the multiple transcript pages covered by this objection) that they claim is an "improper hypothetical."</p>
4/26/2019	267	8	271	23	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to SOM: Relates to DEA's policy on suspicious order monitoring and reporting, including whether DEA's policy and interpretation changed, which are fact issues. See Dkt. # 2483 at 28-29.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Within scope – Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Improper objection covering multiple questions. Defendants cannot respond unless plaintiffs identify which form objection(s) apply to which question(s).</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague</p> <p>RESPONSE: DOJ specifically authorized testimony on the witness's personal recollection regarding DEA's interpretation and enforcement of 21 C.F.R. 1374(b). Plaintiffs must identify which question (out of the multiple transcript pages covered by this objection) that they claim is an "improper hypothetical."</p>
4/26/2019	271	24	274	4	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to SOM: Relates to DEA's policy on suspicious order monitoring and reporting, including whether DEA's policy and interpretation changed, which are fact issues. See Dkt. # 2483 at 28-29.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Within scope – Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Improper objection covering multiple questions. Defendants cannot respond unless plaintiffs identify which form objection(s) apply to which question(s).</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague</p> <p>RESPONSE: DOJ specifically authorized testimony on the witness's personal recollection regarding DEA's interpretation and enforcement of 21 C.F.R. 1374(b). Plaintiffs must identify which question (out of the multiple transcript pages covered by this objection) that they claim is an "improper hypothetical."</p>
4/26/2019	274	10	276	2	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to SOM: Relates to DEA's policy on suspicious order monitoring and reporting, including whether DEA's policy and interpretation changed, which are fact issues. See Dkt. # 2483 at 28-29.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Within scope – Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not duplicative/cumulative of other designations from witness's testimony or any other DEA witness. To the extent multiple DEA witnesses testified on similar subjects, relevant to show common understanding among DEA officials.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Improper objection covering multiple questions. Defendants cannot respond unless plaintiffs identify which form objection(s) apply to which question(s).</p> <p>RESPONSE: DOJ specifically authorized testimony on the witness's personal recollection regarding DEA's interpretation and enforcement of 21 C.F.R. 1374(b). Plaintiffs must identify which question (out of the multiple transcript pages covered by this objection) that they claim is an "improper hypothetical."</p>

DEFENDANTS' RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS' OBJECTIONS TO AFFIRMATIVE DESIGNATIONS OF JOSEPH RANNAZZISI					
DEPO DATE	NOTES				NOTES
	Begin Page at	Begin Line at	End Page at	End Line at	
4/26/2019	277	8	282	17	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to SOM: Relates to DEA's policy on suspicious order monitoring and reporting, including whether DEA's policy and interpretation changed, which are fact issues. See Dkt. # 2483 at 28-29.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Within scope – Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Improper objection covering multiple questions. Defendants cannot respond unless plaintiffs identify which form objection(s) apply to which question(s).</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not "Asked and Answered": Question was not previously asked by defense counsel.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p> <p>RESPONSE: DOJ specifically authorized testimony on the witness's personal recollection regarding DEA's interpretation and enforcement of 21 C.F.R. 1374(b). Plaintiffs must identify which question (out of the multiple transcript pages covered by this objection) that they claim is an "improper hypothetical."</p>
4/26/2019	286	13	287	1	<p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Within scope – Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p>
4/26/2019	314	21	318	7	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to SOM: Relates to DEA's policy on suspicious order monitoring and reporting, including whether DEA's policy and interpretation changed, which are fact issues. See Dkt. # 2483 at 28-29.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Within scope – Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Improper objection covering multiple questions. Defendants cannot respond unless plaintiffs identify which form objection(s) apply to which question(s).</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not "Asked and Answered": Question was not previously asked by defense counsel.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p>
4/26/2019	320	1	329	7	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to SOM: Relates to DEA's policy on suspicious order monitoring and reporting, including whether DEA's policy and interpretation changed, which are fact issues. See Dkt. # 2483 at 28-29.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Within scope – Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Improper objection covering multiple questions. Defendants cannot respond unless plaintiffs identify which form objection(s) apply to which question(s).</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not "Asked and Answered": Question was not previously asked by defense counsel.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not Vague.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Questions relate to the witness's recollection of how DEA interpreted and enforced the suspicious order regulation, which was specifically authorized by DOJ.</p>
4/26/2019	331	2	331	16	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to SOM: Relates to DEA's policy on suspicious order monitoring and reporting, including whether DEA's policy and interpretation changed, which are fact issues. See Dkt. # 2483 at 28-29.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Within scope – Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Improper objection covering multiple questions. Defendants cannot respond unless plaintiffs identify which form objection(s) apply to which question(s).</p> <p>RESPONSE: Not "Asked and Answered": Question was not previously asked by defense counsel.</p>
5/15/2019	519	13	520	15	<p>RESPONSE: Relevant to SOM: Relates to DEA's policy on suspicious order monitoring and reporting, including whether DEA's policy and interpretation changed, which are fact issues. See Dkt. # 2483 at 28-29.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Does not lack foundation/call for speculation: Personal knowledge based on witness's experience as head of Office of Diversion Control.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Within scope – Authorized by December 10, 2008 letter. See Dkt. # 1176.3.</p> <p>RESPONSE: Objection covers many different questions -- plaintiffs must specify which one they think the witness wasn't allowed to answer. See Witness's answers on 519:1-2, 519:10, and 519:15.</p>
5/15/2019	546	15	546	16	RESPONSE: Answer inadvertently omitted. Responsive designation added.

DEFENDANTS' OBJECTIONS TO PLAINTIFFS' COUNTER DESIGNATIONS						
DEPO DATE	DESIGNATION TYPE					OBJECTIONS
		Begin Page at	Begin Line at	End Page at	End Line at	
4/26/2019	Plaintiff Counter-Designations	25	21	26	2	
4/26/2019	Plaintiff Counter-Designations	29	2	30	2	Improper counter-designation; lack of foundation; calls for speculation; lack of personal knowledge (602)
4/26/2019	Plaintiff Counter-Designations	40	22	41	20	Lack of foundation -- witness testified that he did not attend distributor briefings; lack of personal knowledge (602); calls for speculation
4/26/2019	All Def Counter-Designations	52	19	53	2	
4/26/2019	Plaintiff Counter-Designations	57	6	57	8	Calls for speculation -- asks what witness would have done; incomplete hypothetical; relevance
4/26/2019	Plaintiff Counter-Designations	57	15	57	23	Calls for speculation -- asks what witness would have done; incomplete hypothetical; relevance
4/26/2019	Plaintiff Counter-Designations	87	6	87	9	
4/26/2019	Plaintiff Counter-Designations	87	13	87	17	
4/26/2019	Plaintiff Counter-Designations	99	2	99	17	Non-responsive; assumes facts not in evidence re: manufacturers diverting quota; 403
4/26/2019	Plaintiff Counter-Designations	107	18	108	15	Non-responsive -- coincident responsibility is irrelevant to question re: whether DEA had a "manufacturer initiative"; 403 -- confusing to the jury because witness suggests that DEA had a "manufacturer initiative," when it did not
4/26/2019	Plaintiff Counter-Designations	109	17	109	21	Non-responsive -- witness did not answer the question; improper counter-designation
4/26/2019	Plaintiff Counter-Designations	109	25	110	5	Non-responsive -- witness did not answer the question; improper counter-designation
4/26/2019	Plaintiff Counter-Designations	110	19	110	21	Non-responsive -- witness did not answer the question
4/26/2019	Plaintiff Counter-Designations	110	25	111	10	Non-responsive -- witness did not answer the question
4/26/2019	Plaintiff Counter-Designations	112	10	122	22	Non-responsive -- witness did not answer the question; improper counter-designation; 403
4/26/2019	Plaintiff Counter-Designations	114	14	115	19	Non-responsive; 403 -- would mislead jury by suggesting that the 2006 and 2007 letters informed manufacturers that they needed to monitor pharmacies, when they did not; 403; witness misstates the record
4/26/2019	Plaintiff Counter-Designations	116	24	117	17	Non-responsive -- witness did not answer the question, which asked him to identify any "guidance in writing" requiring manufacturers to "know what is happening with their drugs downstream." Witness pointed to the CSA and CFR, which contain no such guidance. Witness misstates the record; 403.
4/26/2019	Plaintiff Counter-Designations	202	18	203	20	Improper counter-designation; lack of foundation; incomplete hypothetical; calls for speculation
4/26/2019	Plaintiff Counter-Designations	247	24	248	2	
4/26/2019	Plaintiff Counter-Designations	253	1	253	23	Hearsay; non-responsive; lack of foundation
4/26/2019	Plaintiff Counter-Designations	256	9	257	4	
5/15/2019	Plaintiff Counter-Designations	530	22	531	19	Lack of personal knowledge (602); lack of foundation

5/15/2019	All Def Counter-Designations	546	15	546	22	
5/15/2019	Plaintiff Counter-Designations	631	17	681	2	Improper Counter-Designation. Defendants incorporate their objections to Plaintiffs' affirmative designations.